



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Not only is the celibacy discussion started in the Melibeus-Monk-Nonne Preest Group, but the tales of marriage begin there too. Chaucer's tale of the patient wife, Prudence; the Host's tale of his wrathful wife; the Monk's tale of the treacherous wife, Delilah; Sir John's tale of the foolish wife, Pertelote; are all part of the series which includes the Wyf of Bath, the wife of Sir Gawain, the patient Griselda, the Merchant's bride, and Dorigen, the perfect wife. Sir John's comments on women take on, then, a new significance:

Wommanes conseil broghte us first to wo,  
 And made Adam fro Paradys to go,  
 Ther as he was ful mery, and wel at ese.  
 But for I noot, to whom it might displese,  
 If I conseil of wommen wolde blame,  
 Passe over, for I seyde it in my game.  
 Rede auctours where they trete of swich matere,  
 And what they seye of wommen ye may here.  
 Thise ben the cokkes wordes, and not myne;  
 I can noon harm of no womman devyne.

Sir John, like the traditional Clerk attacked by the Wyf of Bath, reads, in old authors, stories of bad women. The Monk's story of Delilah has reminded him of them. But he is the servant of a very fastidious lady and is speaking in her presence; he, therefore, finds it necessary to make his criticism of woman as brief and as good-natured as possible.

SAMUEL B. HEMINGWAY.

*Yale College.*

## REVIEWS

*The Cambridge History of English Literature.* Vol. XII: The Nineteenth Century I. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1916.

The reviewer, embarrassed by the wealth of material offered him in this volume, of necessity relies upon the somewhat mechanical scheme of attempting a survey of the more noteworthy chapters, postponing till later in his notice some general considerations suggested by the work.

Mr. T. F. Henderson, continuing the studies in the literature of

Scotland that have appeared in earlier volumes, contributes the opening chapter on Scott. It has the faults and merits of the same writer's study of Burns in volume XI.<sup>1</sup> A pleasant if somewhat slow-moving essay, it dwells on such matters as Scott's ability to portray character, his wide sympathies, his historical inaccuracies. The grave error is made of considering him as an isolated phenomenon, unrelated to other developments in the novel. The account of Scott's literary growth is hap-hazard,<sup>2</sup> and there is practically no biographical information. Mr. Henderson has not written the authoritative article that one would look for in a standard work of reference. In marked contrast is Professor Moorman's study of Byron, perhaps the most distinguished portion of the volume, which combines happily the essential facts of the poet's life with much penetrating criticism. To some of us the conclusion that Byron's contribution to European thought was chiefly negative may seem merely traditional criticism. But we shall find satisfaction in the high general estimate in which his work is held. The chapter deserves to be regarded as in a measure a summary of the great mass of technical and popular literature on the subject produced during the Byronic revival of the last twenty years.

Professor Herford's studies of Shelley and Keats contain various judgments the validity of which one is tempted to question. This is specially the case in the chapter on Shelley. Thus, of the climax of *Prometheus Unbound* he writes (p. 72): "Jupiter topples from his throne, as it were, at a touch; indeed the stroke of doom is here so instantaneous and so simple as to be perilously near the grotesque." This remark exhibits a failure to comprehend the effect striven for by the poet. The passage in question is III. i, 63 f. Jupiter addresses Demogorgon:

I trample thee! thou lingerest?

Mercy! Mercy!

---

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxx, 184.

<sup>2</sup> My colleague, Dr. H. J. Savage, calls my attention to the lack of any indication of the important part played by Norse studies in this development; on which see F. E. Farley, "Scandinavian Influences in the English Romantic Movement," *Harvard Studies and Notes*, 1903; it may be added that there is an unpublished Harvard dissertation by P. R. Lieder, in which Farley's conclusions are verified and augmented.

This is an instance of dramatic reserve. Between the first and second parts of the line the conflict, the awfulness and sublimity of which are left to the reader's imagination, is supposed to occur.<sup>3</sup> Again, in contrasting *Prometheus* and *The Cenci*, Herford writes (p. 75): "That Shelley, after a few weeks' interval, could carry out, with unfaltering hand, and with supreme success, a poetic transition not less astonishing than would have been the appearance of *Samson Agonistes* on the morrow of *Comus*, marks his will power no less than his imaginative range." Surely the transition is overestimated, for there are very clear points of contact between the two works, and *The Cenci* has been regarded by some critics as hardly more than a reworking of the theme of *Prometheus*, the conflict of good and evil, the Count taking the place of Jupiter and Beatrice of Prometheus. Another point made with regard to *The Cenci* is aesthetically, perhaps even morally, questionable. "He is drawn with a reticence of which no Elizabethan would have been capable, and the horror of his act is so far mitigated that its motive is hate, not lust" (p. 76). Does this fact mitigate the horror? Is not Ford's interpretation of the theme psychologically and ethically more nearly sound in that the *love* of Giovanni and Annabella is emphasized, the fact of consanguinity being secondary, while in Shelley's play, upon the motive of hatred is superimposed *ab extra* the additional offence of incest?

In the two chapters written by Mr. Saintsbury we find those characteristics to which we must resign ourselves in all that comes now-a-days from his pen: much that is lively, something that is shrewd, everything that is unsystematic, formless, impressionistic. His helter-skelter classifications into "bunches" and "batches" are unconvincing; his constant allusions to his range of reading of authors that, as he says (p. 115), "bore a generation which thinks

<sup>3</sup> Compare the restraint shown in Browning's first account of the murder of Pompilia and her foster-parents (*R. and B.*, 1):

Wide as a heart, opened the door at once,  
Showing the joyous couple, and their child,  
The two-weeks' mother, to the wolves, the wolves  
To them. *Close eyes!* [*italics mine*] And when the corpses lay  
Stark-stretched, etc.

Compare also the unspoken but very dramatic judgment rendered by the "friend" who acts as umpire between the disputants in Meredith's *Ballad of Fair Ladies in Revolt* (stanza xli).

it knows everything already," are amusingly garrulous at times, but by repetition serve only to fill precious space that might have been occupied with a definite presentation of the *facts* of the matter under consideration. This is very apparent in the chapter on the Landors, De Quincey, and Leigh Hunt. The arrangement, for which the editors must be responsible, is ill-advised; Landor at least deserves separate study, and De Quincey is as much entitled to it as are Lamb and Hazlitt; while Hunt could have fallen in with the other lesser poets. To De Quincey is devoted less than five pages, an entirely disproportionate allotment as compared with that accorded his two fellow essayists. Moreover the reader who has found satisfactory sketches of the life of Hazlitt and of Lamb will turn in vain to the pages on De Quincey for similar information. Mr. Saintsbury declares that "biography, almost always unnecessary here, is, in this special place, almost wholly negligible" (p. 228). Why? And if generally unnecessary in this *History*, why is it supplied by nearly all contributors? In its place Mr. Saintsbury occupies several precious pages with the effort to prove the value and reasonableness of studying these three writers together. He then chats at length and quite agreeably about Landor, but manages to give less information in more space than is consistent with edification. Contrast the carefully ordered study of the same subject in Professor Elton's *Survey of English Literature*, II, 13 f. Slap-dash-ish criticism (as one can imagine Mr. Saintsbury himself calling it) runs riot in the chapter on the minor poets. Once more comparison with Elton's work is inevitable, and the study of the same groups in Walker's *Literature of the Victorian Era*, to which reference is made neither in text nor in bibliography, is far better than Mr. Saintsbury's. Nearly all the minor poets are included in this chapter, in one place or another (sometimes, as in the case of Hood, treated under several different heads, thus avoiding any possibility of a coördinated survey of their entire work). We look in vain, however, for George Croly and Professor Wilson, though *The Modern Orlando* of the one and *The Isle of Palms* of the other are as worthy of record as much that he receives into his chapter. Of individual judgments I note here only the surprisingly low estimate of the poems of William Barnes.

Several chapters may be passed over with a word or two. A. R. D. Elliot's account of the Reviews and Magazines of the early years of the century, excellent as it is and written by one who speaks

with authority on such matters, would have been of greater value had it been preceded by a chapter in an earlier volume dealing with the beginnings of such publications in the eighteenth century. It is perhaps natural that Mr. Elliot gives to the *Edinburgh Review* and its first great rival what must to the unprejudiced mind seem disproportionate space. The study of Hazlitt by Professor Howe (the only American scholar in the volume) and that of Lamb by A. H. Thompson require no comment. Mr. Harold Child's exalted estimate of Jane Austen can be accepted in full only if we limit very straitly the province of the novel; his failure to set her in relation to other writers results in an overstatement of her absolute importance. The same critic's account of the lesser novelists is meagre in the extreme.<sup>4</sup> In a chapter that affords fine opportunities for his special qualifications Sir Adolphus Ward continues from earlier volumes his discussion of English Historians, in this case departing from strict chronological order to consider together the writers on ancient and ecclesiastical history, postponing historians of other epochs to a later volume.<sup>5</sup>

The subject of the Oxford Movement in its relation to literature has been assigned to Archdeacon Hutton who brings to his task the advantage of thoro familiarity and sympathy with his theme, an advantage that is in a measure offset by a lack of that objectivity that a quite unprejudiced writer, approaching the Movement from the point of view only of English scholarship, might so readily have furnished. Mr. Hutton at times exaggerates the value of the literary achievement of some of the Tractarians (and of those whom he chooses to consider Tractarians, for the embrace is very wide that includes Trench and Peacock). To say of some of Archbishop Trench's lyrics that they "belong to the highest flight of English poetry" (p. 302) is rather absurd; the statement that Isaac Williams "was a true poet, who, it may be, has not yet come into his own" (p. 294) requires the stern corrective supplied by Professor Walker: "Nothing he has written is likely to survive, or deserves to survive" (*Lit. Vict. Era*, p. 341). Writing of Keble as Professor of Poetry Mr. Hutton says (p. 293): "It may be that

<sup>4</sup> The name of Anthony Trollope's eldest brother was Thomas Adolphus, not Augustus (p. 273).

<sup>5</sup> Ward writes (p. 351) of the "logical discoveries" of Sir Henry Rawlinson. This seems to be a misprint, probably for "archæological."

the lectures he delivered, written, as they were, in the choice Latin of which he was a master, will never be read again"—a remark that betrays ignorance of the existence of the recent excellent translation by E. K. Francis, to which there is unaccountably no reference in the bibliography. Pusey's active coöperation with the Tractarians dates from late in 1833, not 1834 (p. 286). To class *John Inglesant*, even tentatively, with the novels of Miss Yonge (p. 307) is to undervalue Shorthouse's famous book. One misses in bibliography and text the name of Dean Mansel, important as controversialist, disciple of Newman, and stylist. More serious *lacunae* are the lack of any review of the political and ecclesiastical background at the time of Keble's Assize Sermon without which the genesis of the Movement is not accounted for, and the failure to connect the Movement with other branches of enthusiastic activity such as the teaching of John Ruskin and the practice of the Pre-Raphaelites and kindred spirits, or to trace the influence of the Catholic Revival upon the other arts, especially architecture and music. To touch upon this last subject would have been perhaps going too far afield.

The Rev. F. E. Hutchinson's study of "The Growth of Liberal Theology" requires some supplementary treatment of the influence of the scientific discoveries of the period. Lyell's geological investigations, revolutionary tho they were; the *Vestiges*; the climax of the scientific movement in 1859; the epoch-making Oxford meeting of the British Association in 1860;—these and other such events are passed over in silence. I confess to being puzzled as to why the work of George Tyrrell should be included in this chapter. The whole modernist movement of which he was so brilliant a part is in origins so far removed from the now rather discredited semi-rationalistic latitudinarianism of the mid-Victorian epoch, is so essentially allied to the liberal Gallican Catholicism of men like Father Hyacinth (who would have repudiated any connection with Broad Church thought), that it is hard to reconcile oneself to the presence of this mystic follower of Saint Thomas in the company of Whately, Jowett, Maurice, and Stanley.

Finally, there is the curious, garrulous, amorphous account of "Scholars, Antiquaries and Bibliographers" by Sir J. E. Sandys.

\* I note an extraordinary blunder in the proof-reading of this chapter: "symbolised" for "sympathised" (p. 327).

The author of the *History of Classical Scholarship* covers even more briefly than in the corresponding portion of the recent abridgment of his *History* the field with which he is so well acquainted. One might expect that compression would result in more systematic outline, but instead we have a discourse in what scholars might call the Public Orator's latest manner, a quaint mixture of learning and triviality. Outside his own field Sir John is just as formless and no longer authoritative; note for example the slim page devoted to English studies, in which not so much as a poor line does honor to the memory of Doctor Furnivall. One longs for some keen generalizations, some evidence of breadth of vision, in the mass of details, names, titles, and dates, scattered so profusely thru this chapter: and one wonders whether the material dealt with therein is properly included in a history of literature at all.<sup>7</sup>

The Romantic Period to a greater extent than any other era in English literature demands, for its proper comprehension, some examination of the basic attitude of mind, the current theories, social, political, philosophical, that were dominant and whose strands are interwoven in the work of all the writers of the time. Some such study, not necessarily committed to one definite thesis like Watts-Dunton's "Renaissance of Wonder" (perhaps better not so committed), was an imperative need in this volume; and it is not here. Hardly an indication of the many and delicate threads that bind together the various strands of Romanticism is to be found. This is due largely to the exigencies of composite authorship, but some remedy might have been found in the shape of an introductory chapter dealing with the broadest aspects of the theme.

Between so many stools some things are almost certain to fall to the ground; in this case it is the drama of the period that has received the severest jar. It is ignored. This may be due to Professor Routh's absence at the front or to a surely unwise plan to take up the subject in volume XIII at the point at which it was dropped in volume XI. There is thus no account of the Elizabethan revival, no study of Milman's by no means despicable work in the drama (Ward himself speaks of him, p. 352, as conspicuous among dramatists), no barest mention of so important a landmark as

<sup>7</sup> Note two errors of fact with regard to Mark Pattison (p. 371): he was Rector of Lincoln College, not Exeter; he published no book with the title *Essays on Scaliger*.



Maturin's *Bertram*. In Mr. Saintsbury's chapters the assumption is constant<sup>8</sup> of the presence near-by of a parallel study of the contemporary drama.

Evidence of the lack of precise coördination in the bibliographies as in the text is at times apparent. Why is Symons' *Romantic Movement* listed among the Shelley authorities and not among those for Byron, Keats, or any other poet? Why is Herford's *Age of Wordsworth* noted for Hazlitt and not for any other writer? Why is there not a preliminary general bibliography in which such works as Symons' and Herford's and Elton's and Walker's and many more could have been listed once for all? Why are dates of birth and death supplied in the bibliography in the case of many minor writers and omitted in others (*e. g.*, Mrs. Trollope)?<sup>9</sup>

The bibliographies have all along been a most useful part of the three Cambridge *Histories*. In this volume, tho excellent in the main, they are so far from exhaustive as to omit various works of importance. The following list of *addenda* and *corrigenda* is a selection only from my marginal notes.

Chapter II (Byron): To editions of the works add: the *Cambridge Byron*, ed. P. E. More, and the *Werke*, ed. F. Brie, Leipzig, 1912. A section should have been devoted to Selections as in the case of the Shelley and Keats bibliographies. Among authorities add: E. H. Coleridge's article in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th ed., and Watts-Dunton's in *Chambers' Cyclopædia* (1903), vol. III; P. E. More, "The Wholesome Revival of Byron," *Atlantic Monthly*, Dec. 1898; George Rebec, "Byron and Morals," *International Journal of Ethics*, XIV; Ruskin, in "Fiction, Fair and Foul"; and Swinburne's "Byron and Wordsworth" in *Miscellanies*. It was of course impossible to include all dissertations and the several whose omission I have noted need not be here set down. A list of novels founded on Byron's life, such as those by Lady Caroline Lamb, Disraeli, F. F. Moore, and Maurice Hewlett, would have been of interest. Here, as elsewhere in the bibliographies, the error is often made of dating articles by their first appearance in book-form instead of by their first publication. This results at times in serious distortion of historical perspective, as when Macaulay's essay on Byron is dated 1853 instead of 1830, or Swinburne's earlier essay on Byron is dated ten years after its

<sup>8</sup> For example, p. 123 with regard to Taylor; p. 234 with regard to Landor.

<sup>9</sup> The Table of Principal Dates is not impeccable, Byron's birth being set back ten years.

original appearance. To John Murray is credited (p. 438) the authorship of *Lord Byron and his Detractors*. Murray wrote but one section of that book, the other two being by E. H. Pember and R. E. Prothero respectively.

Chapter III (Shelley): In section iii add: *Select Poems*, ed. W. J. Alexander, 1898; in section iv add: *Prometheus Unbound*, ed. V. D. Scudder, 1905 (the best separate edition); in section viii add: Arthur Dillon, *Shelley's Philosophy of Love*, 1888; Joseph Giesen, *Shelley als Übersetzer*, 1910; P. E. More, "Shelley," in *Shelburne Essays*; F. Olivero, *Saggi di Letteratura inglese*, p. 123-176 (especially on Dante and Shelley).

Chapter V (The Lesser Poets): p. 450: the Routledge Pocket Library edition of Rogers' *Italy* is not the same as that of 1830 with engravings by Turner and Stothard; p. 457, under Hartley Coleridge, add: *Poetical Works*, ed. R. Colles; p. 459, under Mrs. Hemans, add: *Poetical Works*, Oxford, 1914; p. 465, under W. S. Rose, add the translation of Ariosto, which is much better known than the Boiardo.

Chapter XII (The Oxford Movement): Of many omissions the following are specially noteworthy: F. Ware Cornish, *History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century*, II, chapters viii-xiv; C. T. Cruttwell, *Six Lectures on the Oxford Movement*; E. Halevy, *Histoire du peuple anglais au XIX<sup>me</sup> siècle*, vol. I (contains an admirable study of religious conditions in the years immediately following 1815); W. G. Hutchinson, *The Oxford Movement* (contains a convenient reprint of eighteen important Tracts, including no. xc); S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (this excellent work appeared too late to be included). Tullock's *Movements of Religious Thought* and Gladstone's *Ecclesiastical and Religious Correspondence* cast light on various phases of the Movement. Under J. A. Froude, p. 500, add: "The Oxford Counter Reformation," *Short Studies*, IV, 151. To authorities on Newman add: L. E. Gates, *Three Studies in Literature* (excellent from the purely literary point of view); P. E. More's essay in *The Drift of Romanticism* [Have the compilers of these bibliographies ever heard of Mr. More's essays?]; Wilfrid Ward, *Men and Manners*.

Chapter XIII (The Growth of Liberal Theology): p. 509: V. F. Storr's work is *The Development of English Theology* [not "Thought"] in the Nineteenth Century.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

Bryn Mawr College.